DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 439 159 TM 030 696

AUTHOR Blair, Jeremy
TITLE Ambivalent Racism Scale.
PUB DATE 1999-12-00
NOTE 18p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; *College Students; Higher Education; *Measures (Individuals); *Racial Bias; Reliability; Test Construction; Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Ambivalence (Psychology)

ABSTRACT

A series of studies was conducted to develop and validate a scale to study racism in its newly adapted, ambivalent form. The scale was designed to measure the separate positively correlated hostile and benevolent components of racism. The first two studies, which involved 39 and 73 college students, established the questions that could be used for the scale and provided data that support the instrument's internal validity and reliability. The third study involving 39 college students and a planned fourth study are expected to establish convergent validity between the Ambivalent Racism Scale (ARS) that was developed and other measures of racism and ambivalent behavior, including the Modern Racism Scale (J. McConahay, 1986). The final study should replicate the findings that subjects can hold two conflicting views about one group at the same time. These two attitudes, when stimulated at the same time, create a feeling of racial ambivalence. (Contains 12 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 439 159

Ambivalent Racism Scale

Jeremy Blair

Jeremy Blair
5B. East Athens Ave.
Ardmore, PA 19003
610-542-3115 (Office)
610-658-2815 (Work)

TM030696

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The Ambivalent Racism Scale

Research points to a continual evolution of racism in the United States. While racial relations shift and alter, the language we use to describe those relations must change accordingly in order to depict racial phenomena accurately. Old terms must be replaced with new, accurate terms, and novel ideas about racism must be introduced to explain the changing face of the most modern forms of racism. From the late 1930's to the early 1980's, social psychologists noticed a marked change in the way that whites expressed their racist opinions toward blacks. "Old fashioned" racism might have been overtly expressed through public, racist policies or printed in the New York Times. In 1944, many blacks were not allowed to use "white" facilities like drinking fountains or "whites'" bathrooms (Allport, 1954). However, the face of racism changed over time (Crossly, Bromley, & Saxe, 1980, Kinder & Sears, 1981, Swim, 1995). It became unpopular to explicitly state racist opinions, so many anti-black sentiments were expressed through symbolic racism (Kinder & Sears, Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). Instead of plainly stating racist views, white Americans expressed their prejudice against symbols that represented blacks. Many people symbolically opposed blacks by rebelling against public busing policies that worked to secure equal rights in education for black children (Bobo, 1983).

Racism had taken on a new form, and thus had to be redefined. In 1986, McConahay created a new scale to measure the "modern" form of racism (McConahay, 1986). The Modern Racism Scale measured whites' attitudes toward blacks by

combining the old fashioned ideas about racism with the recent symbolic form of racism. The scale identifies two types of racism and tries to distinguish between the two types. Old fashioned racism, or traditional (pre-1979) racism, is identified by asking questions like "Do you think blacks are born with the same level of intelligence as whites?" Then this domain is contrasted with the newer form of modern racism marked by symbolic prejudice and indirect discrimination against blacks. The two separate domains are identified allowing each form of racism can be individually examined, and in relation to the other domain. This new tool worked to explore the adapted model of American racism.

Until 1988 racism was indexed by measures of antipathy, such as social distance (Crosby et al., 1980) and negative stereotypes (Sigall & Page, 1971). Social psychologists centered research around these topics until new research began in the area of racial ambivalence. Many people are familiar with what Katz, Wackenhut, and Hass (1986) cited as Hostile racism. Racist antipathy, avoidance, and the resulting discrimination cluster under Gordon Allport's original, umbrella definition of prejudice. For example, if a person is racist against blacks they might physically attack a black woman during a KKK rally (antipathy), or they might not attend social functions in which blacks will be present (avoidance). A hostile racist might also display his or her racism through reliance on racist stereotypes for hiring employees or making decisions about political candidates (discrimination).

In contrast, Benevolent racism (introduced in 1986 by Katz and Hass) can be defined as "a set of interrelated attitudes toward blacks that are racist in terms of viewing blacks stereotypically and in restricted roles, but are subjectively positive in feeling tone

(for the perceiver) and tend to elicit behaviors typically categorized by prosocial"(as cited in Glick, & Fiske, 1995). The idea of ambivalent racism states that whites' racial attitudes have again metamorphisized. Racial attitudes have become complex, with feelings of friendliness and rejection toward black people often existing side by side (Katz & Hass, 1988). Research shows that whites maintain a hostile racism based on anti-black views rooted in the Protestant Ethic, while also harboring pro-black sentiments stemming from American core values of Humanitarianism and Egalitarianism (Katz et al., 1986 and 1988, and Glick et al., 1994).

Max Weber's Protestant Ethic states that many people believe that being a good person is dependent on a good work ethic and strong dedication to their job. One might be able to work his or her way into heaven. In turn, bad people are those who are lazy and display little desire to work and contribute to society. Katz and Hass (1988) blamed this view as a motivation for white hostility toward blacks. Racist stereotypes claim that blacks are lazy and do not do their part in society, therefore they are not good people. In contrast, while the Protestant Ethic leads to anti-black sentiment, Humanitarian and Egalitarian values lead to pro-black, pro-human feelings. These values state that all people are created equal and should be given equal rights as humans. They also imply that each human is responsible for the well being of their, often times disadvantaged, peers. It is clear how holding these values might promote a positive attitude toward all humans. Ambivalence is induced when a single person maintains both views (Hostile and Benevolent) simultaneously.

Like the ideas of symbolic and modern racism, ambivalent racism represents another step in the racial evolution of America. Again a change has occurred, and again

we must modify our language and approach to our study of racism in order to describe the phenomenon correctly. The purpose of this study is to create a valid and reliable measure of ambivalent racism. Like the Modern Racism Scale which was introduced to explore the new idea of modern racism, the Ambivalent Racism Scale (ARS) will work to explain and identify the newly adapted form of racism. This study will attempt to replicate the finding that racism has separate, positively correlated hostile and benevolent components, that these components can be measured (including the phenomenon of ambivalent racism) in a valid and reliable way through the use of the ARS, and that high scores on the hostile racism domain of the ARS will predict negative attitudes and stereotypes about blacks, while high scores on the benevolent racism domain of the ARS will predict positive attitudes and stereotypes.

Methods

This paper presents data from four studies conducted to develop and validate the Ambivalent Racism Scale. The first two studies established which questions could be used for the scale and provided internal validity and reliability data, while the second two studies established convergent validity between the ARS and other measures of racism and ambivalent behavior.

Study 1

Participants

Thirty- nine college students (22 men and 17 women, ages 18-23) volunteered to participate. Participants were offered extra credit for their participation, and were treated in accordance with the "Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct" (American Psychological Association, 1992).

Materials

Three types of questions were used to create the Ambivalent Racism Scale (ARS): Hostile Racism domain questions and Benevolent Racism domain questions. A third set of Lie scale questions were added to establish desirable responding scores. The questions were created for the purpose of eliciting attitudes about blacks in an array of areas including work, athletics, education, family roles, civil rights, artistic ability, and federal funding. Past research and literature on racism, discrimination, stereotyping, and prejudice was used to create the questions for the two domains (see appendix 1 for sources used in this process).

Administration of the ARS utilized the initial set of 89 questions (see appendix 2) and the ARS score sheet (see appendix 3). Approximately 28% of the questions were reversed scored, while the remaining items were scored normally.

Procedure

Forty-one items were created to measure the Benevolent Racism (BR) domain, and 47 were created to tap into the Hostile Racism (HR) domain. One free response question was presented at the end all of the questions. An item analysis was performed using two criteria of acceptability: An item had to show a significant correlation with the total score of items of the same type, and a low to zero correlation with total score of items of the opposite type. Items that did not meet these criteria were discarded.

Results

These items were administered to all 39 subjects in order to determine the correlations for qualification. The items were randomized to defeat any order bias, and

scored on a scale of 1-6 (strongly agree to strongly disagree). The subjects were asked to anonymously complete all questions with the assurance of confidentiality.

Upon analysis, items were selected that meet the aforementioned criteria. Twenty-one hostile items and 26 benevolent items met the set criteria. One item from each domain was eliminated after achieving a negative correlation with items from the same domain or with items from the opposite domain. All lie scale items were eliminated based on this cut off.

A factor analysis was conducted on the remaining 47 items in order to select items that established clear, distinct factors. A principal components analysis was conducted on all 47 items using SPSS with an oblique rotation with Kaiser Normalization. No mean substitution for missing information was used on the data. As predicted by the theory of Ambivalent Racism, the four strongest factors (with initial eigenvlues above one) corresponded exactly to the four theoretical domains proposed by Katz and Hass.

The data's pattern matrix was used to eliminate items that had a factor loading lower than .40 or a loading on more than one factor above .40. This cut off narrowed the question pool down to 20 questions that loaded onto the four proposed theoretical areas of Ambivalent Racism. Together these four predicted factors accounted for 63.32% of the total variance explained. These 20 items constituted the second set of questions to be tested for use on the final version of the ARS.

Study 2

Participants

Seventy-three college students (43 men and 30 women, ages 18-24) volunteered to participate. Participants were offered extra credit for their participation, and were treated in accordance with the "Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct" (American Psychological Association, 1992).

Materials

Two types of questions were used to create the Ambivalent Racism Scale (ARS): Hostile Racism domain questions and Benevolent Racism domain questions. The questions were created for the purpose of eliciting attitudes about blacks in an array of areas including work, athletics, education, family roles, civil rights, artistic ability, and federal funding. These question types were intended to tap into the four theoretical areas proposed by Katz and Hass in their original theory of Ambivalent Racism. Study one showed that the questions measure four separate domains including Pro-Black attitude, Anti-Black attitude, Humanitarian and Egalitarian views, and views on the Protestant Work Ethic.

Administration of the ARS utilized the second set of 20 questions and the ARS score sheet (see appendix 3). Approximately 30% of the questions were reversed scored, while the remaining items were scored normally.

Procedure

Twenty items were selected in study one that met the statistical criteria for items used in test construction. An item analysis was performed using two criteria of acceptability: An item had to show a significant correlation with the total score of items

of the same type, and a low to zero correlation with total score of items of the opposite type. Items that did not meet these criteria were discarded.

Results

These items were administered to all 73 subjects in order to determine the correlations for qualification. The items were randomized to defeat any order bias, and scored on a scale of 1-6 (strongly agree to strongly disagree). The subjects were asked to anonymously complete all questions with the assurance of confidentiality.

Upon analysis, items were selected that meet the aforementioned criteria. Eight hostile items and 12 benevolent items met the set criteria.

A factor analysis was conducted on the 20 items in order to select items that best established clear, distinct factors. A principal components analysis was conducted the 20 items using SPSS with an oblique rotation with Kaiser Normalization. No mean substitution for missing information was used on the data. Once again the four strongest factors (with initial eigenvlues above one) corresponded exactly to the four theoretical domains proposed by Katz and Hass (however, in a different order than study one).

The data's pattern matrix was used to eliminate items that had a factor loading lower than .40 or a loading on more than one factor above .40. This cut off narrowed the question pool down to 15 questions that loaded onto the four proposed theoretical areas of Ambivalent Racism. Together these four predicted factors accounted for 58.56% of the total variance expiained. These 15 items constituted the final to be used on the final version of the ARS.

The first factor contained 7 questions that corresponded to the Humanitarian/Egalitarian component of Ambivalent Racism (eigenvalue = 3.679

accounting for 24.53% of variance). The second factor contained 3 items and corresponded to the Protestant Work Ethic portion of the theory (eigenvalue = 2.262 accounting for 15.08% of variance). The third factor was a two question Anti-Black measure (eigenvalue = 1.59 accounting for 10.61% of variance), while the fourth was a three question Pro-Black component (eigenvalue = 1.251 accounting for 8.3% of variance).

Internal Validity and Relaibility

The true measure of a good psychological test is the degree to which one is able to say that a test is a valid and reliable measure of the construct that it is designed to measure. A test must have internal validity and internal consistency. The factor analysis shows that the items divide into four non-correlated factors that match the factors hypothesized by the theory. The item selection criteria enable the test to show that items only measure one clear domain, and that no other domain is being measured by a single item. Together these two steps in our analysis show that the Ambivalent Racism Scale is internally valid, and provide support for the theory by showing that 112 college students have two separate coexisting types of racist attitudes.

The test has also shown that it has internal consistency overall, and is a reliable measure within each domain. The ARS has a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of .7127. When the domains are analyzed separately they have high split-half reliability coefficients (benevolent items: N = 8, Guttman .7506, Spearman-Brown Equal-length = .7518, Unequal-length = .7518; hostile items: N = 7, Guttman .6374, Spearman-Brown Equal = .6410, Unequal = .6445). Due to the nature of the dual domain analysis, the numbers might be higher than if the 15 items all worked to measure a single domain. However, they still meet the minimum arbitrary cut off for reliability coefficients.

Study 3

Participants

Thirty-nine college students (22 men and 17 women, ages 18-23) volunteered to participate. Participants were offered extra credit for their participation, and were treated in accordance with the "Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct" (American Psychological Association, 1992).

Materials

Three types of questions were used to create the Ambivalent Racism Scale (ARS): Hostile Racism domain questions and Benevolent Racism domain questions. A third set of Lie scale questions were added to establish desirable responding scores. The questions were created for the purpose of eliciting attitudes about blacks in an array of areas including work, athletics, education, family roles, civil rights, artistic ability, and federal funding. Past research and literature on racism, discrimination, stereotyping, and prejudice was used to create the questions for the two domains (see appendix 1 for sources used in this process).

Administration of the ARS utilized the initial set of 89 questions (see appendix 2) and the ARS score sheet (see appendix 3). Approximately 28% of the questions were reversed scored, while the remaining items were scored normally.

Procedure

Forty-one items were created to measure the Benevolent Racism (BR) domain, and 47 were created to tap into the Hostile Racism (HR) domain. One free response question was presented at the end all of the questions. An item analysis was performed using two criteria of acceptability: An item had to show a significant correlation with the

total score of items of the same type, and a low to zero correlation with total score of items of the opposite type. Items that did not meet these criteria were discarded.

These items were administered to all 39 subjects in order to determine the correlations for qualification. The items were randomized to defeat any order bias, and scored on a scale of 1-6 (strongly agree to strongly disagree). The subjects were asked to anonymously complete all questions with the assurance of confidentiality.

Upon analysis, items were selected that meet the aforementioned criteria. Twenty-one hostile items and 26 benevolent items met the set criteria. One item from each domain was eliminated after achieving a negative correlation with items from the same domain or with items from the opposite domain. All lie scale items were eliminated based on this cut off.

A factor analysis was conducted on the remaining 47 items in order to select items that established clear, distinct factors. A principal components analysis was conducted on all 47 items using SPSS with an oblique rotation with Kaiser Normalization. No mean substitution for missing information was used on the data. As predicted by the theory of Ambivalent Racism, the four strongest factors (with initial eigenvlues above one) corresponded exactly to the four theoretical domains proposed by Katz and Hass.

The data's pattern matrix was used to eliminate items that had a factor loading lower than .40 or a loading on more than one factor above .40. This cut off narrowed the question pool down to 20 questions that loaded onto the four proposed theoretical areas of Ambivalent Racism. Together these four predicted factors accounted for 63.32% of the total variance explained. These 20 items constituted the second set of questions to be tested for use on the final version of the ARS.

Results

Past research gives a basis for the following assumptions about my expected results. The initial item analysis using the two criteria of acceptability will yield two separate domains: Hostile Racism and Benevolent Racism. Each domain will correlate with the total score on items of the same type (a HR question will correlate with a high score on the total HR domain score), and will correlate low to not at all with the total score of items of the opposite type (BR questions will not correlate highly with HR items). Together, they will make up the two independent domains of Ambivalent Racism (AR).

The scale used in the second ARS administration will be analyzed using Pearsons' correlations between scores on individual items and all other items in each domain, while Cronbach's coefficient alpha will be reported for both domains. Due to the criteria of acceptability, the internal consistency coefficients between items in one domain should be high, while it should be low between items in separate domains. Finally, a factor analysis should show that the two domains are separate.

In the second administration, it is expected that there will be a high positive correlation between ARS scores and MRS totals. McConahay (1986) found that the old-fashioned and modern forms of racism were positively correlated. In general, the MRS will provide validity by correlating positively showing that the ARS finds a more general form of racism. There should be a low or negative correlation between the ARS and the SDS, but a high positive correlation between the ARS and the ARI.

This correlation will provide validity by reiterating previous findings that sexism and racism are positively correlated (Glick & Fiske, 1994).

Discussion

The study should replicate the findings that subjects can hold two conflicting views about one group at the same time. These two attitudes when stimulated at the same time create a feeling of racial ambivalence. The study should also show that the ARS is both a valid and reliable measure of this phenomena.

The high correlation between the ARS and MRS will give the scale convergent validity. The correlation the ARI will also give the scale convergent validity and back up the findings that sexism and racism are related. Finally, the negative correlation or zero correlation between the SDS and ARS will provide divergent validity for the ARS from socially desirable responding.

The implications of what this study's findings might mean are paradoxically easy and complex at the same time. Obviously, the scale can be used to evaluate this new kind

of racism and racial attitudes. Exploration can be done on what type of environments might cause someone to have a high HR score alone, a high BR score alone, or a high HR and BR together. The scale can also be used to describe how an attitude towards a group can be expressed differently depending on the given set of circumstances. Why would a person participate in a hate crime against blacks, but in the same week donate money at church to help inner-city black children? This complex behavior can now be explained.

However, the phenomenon is also complex. This finding can make the understanding of motivation for discrimination and prejudice hard to understand. What

happens when both feelings are stimulated at the same time? Is the person likely to act in ways typical of HR respondents or according to their BR beliefs? It is clear that the interaction between the two domains would be harder to understand. More research could focus on outcomes in which the ambivalence is high and a person is forced to take action in either a HR typical way or BR typical way.

References

Allport, G. W. (1954). The nature of prejudice. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bobo, L. (1983). White's opposition to busing: Symbolic racism or realistic group conflict? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 1196-1210.

Crosby, F. J., Bromley, F., & Saxe, L. (1980). Recent unobtrusive studies of black and white discrimination and prejudice: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 87, 546-563.

Crowne, D.P, & Marlowe, D. (1964). The approval motive: Studies in evaluation dependence. New York: Wiley.

Gaertner, S. L. & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The aversive form of racism. In Dovidio and Gaertner (Eds.). Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism. San Diego: Academic Press.

Glick, P. & Fiske, S. T. (1994). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Ms. Lucy Davis Midland Independent School District 615 West Missouri Midland, TX 79701 Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. Submitted for publication.

Katz, I & Hass, R. G. (1988). Racial ambivalence and value conflict: Correlational and priming studies of dual cognitive structures. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 893-905.

Katz, I, Wackenhut, J., & Hass, R. G., (1986). Racial ambivalence, value duality, and behavior. In Dovidio and Gaertner (Eds.). Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism. San Diego: Academic Press.

Kinder, D. R. & Sears, D. O. (1981). Symbolic racism versus racial threats to the "good life." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 414-431.

McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In Dovidio and Gaertner (Eds.). Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism. San Diego: Academic Press.

Sigal, H.& Page, R. (1971). Current stereotypes: a little fading, a little faking. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 18, 247-255.

Swim, J. K. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 199-216.